## **VIRGINIA**

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part I

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on School Year 2002-2003



**DUE DECEMBER 22, 2003 REVISED MAY 10, 2004** 

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WASHINGTON, DC 20202

#### INTRODUCTION

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Consolidated State Performance Report will consist of two information collections each year. The first part of the Consolidated State Performance Report will be due in December of each year and the second part of the report will be due the following Spring.

.

This workbook contains Part I of the U.S. Department of Education's Consolidated State Performance Report instrument for State formula grant programs authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB). The workbook contains State reporting requirements for information from the 2002-2003 school year due to the Department by **December 22**, **2003**. The Secretary will use this information as part of his first annual report to Congress on the implementation of NCLB.

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g.; State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g., the URL for the State Report Card.

#### **GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES**

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **December 22, 2003**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year.

#### TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to <a href="mailto:conreport@ed.gov">conreport@ed.gov</a>, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield U.S. Department of Education Room 3E307 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 361 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date: 05/31/2004 Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Virginia Department of Education Address: P.O. Box 2120 Richmond, Virginia 23218-2120 Person to contact about this report: Name: Linda M. Wallinger Telephone: 804-225-2869 Fax: **804-371-7347** e-mail: lwalling@mail.vak12ed.edu Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jo Lynne DeMary, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Signature

Date

#### I. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2002-2003 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2002-2003 school year.

Grade 3 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	88
Asian/Pacific Islander*	92
Black or African American	72
Hispanic or Latino	78
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*
White	88
Students with Disabilities	64
Limited English Proficient	75
Economically Disadvantaged	72
Migrant	56
Male	83
Female	84

Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03**
All Students	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	78
Asian/Pacific Islander*	82
Black or African American	58
Hispanic or Latino	62
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
Islander	*
White	79
Students with Disabilities	54
Limited English Proficient	56
Economically Disadvantaged	57
Migrant	35
Male	69
Female	76

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

Grade 4 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*	**
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

Grade 4 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*	**
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Grade levels not tested in 2002-2003

Grade 5 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	76
Asian/Pacific Islander*	87
Black or African American	60
Hispanic or Latino	65
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
Islander	*
White	81
Students with Disabilities	50
Limited English Proficient	60
Economically Disadvantaged	59
Migrant	53
Male	73
Female	76

Grade 5 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	83
American Indian or Alaska Native	86
Asian/Pacific Islander*	88
Black or African American	71
Hispanic or Latino	74
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
Islander	*
White	88
Students with Disabilities	63
Limited English Proficient	66
Economically Disadvantaged	70
Migrant	61
Male	80
Female	85

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

Grade 6 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*	**
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*	**
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Grade levels not tested in 2002-2003

Grade 7 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	**
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*	**
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

Grade 7 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced
All Students	School Year 02-03 **
American Indian or Alaska Native	**
Asian/Pacific Islander*	**
Black or African American	**
Hispanic or Latino	**
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	**
Islander*	
White	**
Students with Disabilities	**
Limited English Proficient	**
Economically Disadvantaged	**
Migrant	**
Male	**
Female	**

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Grade levels not tested in 2002-2003

Grade 8 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	71
Asian/Pacific Islander*	90
Black or African American	59
Hispanic or Latino	68
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*
White	81
Students with Disabilities	39
Limited English Proficient	65
Economically Disadvantaged	59
Migrant	58
Male	73
Female	77

Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03
All Students	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	63
Asian/Pacific Islander*	76
Black or African American	52
Hispanic or Latino	53
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
Islander	*
White	78
Students with Disabilities	37
Limited English Proficient	35
Economically Disadvantaged	50
Migrant	45
Male	68
Female	72

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

Grade 11 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03**
All Students	80
American Indian or Alaska Native	76
Asian/Pacific Islander*	89
Black or African American	65
Hispanic or Latino	73
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	*
White	85
Students with Disabilities	54
Limited English Proficient	74
Economically Disadvantaged	69
Migrant	73
Male	79
Female	80

Grade 11 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient and Advanced School Year 02-03***
All Students	92
American Indian or Alaska Native	92
Asian/Pacific Islander*	94
Black or African American	86
Hispanic or Latino	88
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
Islander	*
White	95
Students with Disabilities	73
Limited English Proficient	79
Economically Disadvantaged	86
Migrant	76
Male	91
Female	94

<sup>\*</sup>For reporting purposes, Virginia combines Asian and Pacific Islander.

who took and passed the 11th grade English: Reading end-of-course test.

<sup>\*\*</sup>The Grade 11 Mathematics score is an aggregate score from end-of-course tests administered in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II at the high school level.
\*\*\*The Grade 11 Reading/Language Arts score represents the percentage of students

#### **II. SCHOOLS IN NEED OF IMPROVEMENT**

**A.** In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2003-2004 school year, based upon data from the 2002-2003 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the reason(s) for identification (e.g., missing proficiency target, participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2003-2004 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring).

(See the chart that begins on the next page.)

**B.** Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

As stated in Virginia's Consolidated State Application *Amended* Accountability Workbook, Revised: September 10, 2003, the state accountability system in Virginia prescribed in the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (the "SOA" or "Standards of Accreditation"), found at http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Accountability/soafulltxt.pdf, includes all schools and LEAs. Virginia's current accountability system addresses schoolwide student performance in the aggregate. To maintain one statewide accountability system, Virginia will:

- continue to apply accreditation ratings to all schools, as prescribed in the Standards of Accreditation;
- continue to apply appropriate sanctions and rewards to all identified schools, as prescribed in the Standards of Accreditation:
- apply Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements to all schools and school divisions consistent with Title I, Part A, 1111(b)(2)(B) and as described in Part II.1.e. and Part II.1.f. of Virginia's Consolidated Application approved by USED July 2, 2002;
- apply sanctions to schools and school divisions receiving Title I, Part A, funding in a manner consistent with sections 1116(b) and 1116(c), respectively;
- apply rewards to schools receiving Title I, Part A, funding in a manner consistent with section 1117(b); and
- pair schools that have no tested grades with other schools that serve students who attended those "non-testing" schools in a feeder relationship for accreditation and AYP determinations.

Certain sanctions exist for schools rated *Accredited with Warning*. In summary, schools must:

- undergo an academic review;
- adopt an instructional method with a proven track record of success at raising student achievement, if accredited with warning in English (reading/language arts) and/or mathematics;
- develop a three-year school improvement plan correlated to nine specific criteria; and
- report annually on school improvement plan implementation status.

The nine components of the three-year school improvement plan referenced above are listed below. These components are also termed "action requirements for schools that are *Accredited with Warning.*")

- A description of how the school will meet the provisional accreditation benchmarks, or the requirements to be Fully Accredited, for each of the years covered by the plan;
- Specific measures for achieving and documenting student academic improvement;
- The amount of time in the school day devoted to instruction in the core academic areas;
- Instructional practices designed to remediate students who have not been successful on Standards of Learning tests;
- Intervention strategies designed to prevent further declines in student performance;
- Staff development needed;
- Strategies to involve and assist parents in raising their child's academic performance;
- The need for flexibility or waivers to state or local regulations to meet the objectives of the plan; and
- A description of the manner in which local, state, and federal funds are used to support the implementation of the components of this plan.

The department also provides assistance to certain schools in need of improvement through the Governor's Partnership for Successful Schools (PASS) Initiative. PASS has targeted more than 100 academically warned schools that, due to their struggles with the Standards of Learning tests, are to receive enhanced services from visiting academic review teams. Thirty-four of these schools have also been designated PASS Priority Schools; they will continue to receive additional intervention and follow-up to track the progress made by students, teachers, and administrators.

Through the Comprehensive School Reform program, the department has awarded \$23,004,383 to assist low-performing schools in improving their academic performance. School recipients of these grants have selected a nationally recognized whole-school reform model or have developed a local model that can be supported by research. School programs, incorporating the research-based model, must be able to stimulate a coordinated effort by the administration, staff, and community to increase student performance by covering virtually all aspects of school operations. Additionally, the Department of Education provides technical assistance to these schools to help ensure successful implementation of the selected model.

In addition, each year since its availability, the Virginia Department of Education has taken advantage of the opportunity to reserve two percent of its Title I allocation for School Improvement purposes. Funds are awarded to schools in an effort to assist with the implementation of research-based school reform or to provide other opportunities through instruction, technology, or materials that are typically lacking in high poverty schools. Title I Accountability funds have also been used for similar purposes.

### Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring

\*Yellow shading indicates changes made on May 10, 2004.

		Reason Identified						
		Reading/L	anguage Arts	Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code			Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004
Alexandria City - 5100120	Maury Elementary - 48	x		x				Year 1
Amherst County- 5100210	Central Elementary - 68	х		х				Year 2
Covington City - 5100990	Jeter-Watson Intermediate - 369	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Danville City - 5101110	Woodrow Wilson Elementary - 1926	School made	AYP and will ren two cons		School Improvem n the same subje		I AYP is made	Year 1
Grayson County 5101690	Providence Elementary - 699	х						Year 1
Hampton City - 5101800	Hampton Harbour Academy - 997	x		x				Year 1
Lee County) - 5102190	Keokee Elementary - 897	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					

		Reason Identified						
5		Reading/L	anguage Arts	Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004
Lee County- 5102190	Pennington Middle - 900	x		x				Year 2
Newport News City - 5102640	Briarfield Elementary – 1042	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Petersburg City - 5102910	A.P. Hill Elementary - 1193	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Petersburg City - 5102910	J.E.B. Stuart Elementary - 1196	x						Year 1
Petersburg City - 5102910	Peabody Middle - 1197	x		x				Year 1
Petersburg City - 5102910	Robert E. Lee Elementary - 1200	x		x				Year 2
Petersburg City - 5102910	Vernon Johns School - 653	x		x				Year 2
Petersburg City - 5102910	Westview Elementary - 1204	School made	AYP and will ren two cons		School Improvem n the same subje		I AYP is made	Year 1

		Reason Identified						
District No. 10	District Name & School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code Code	Reading/L	anguage Arts	Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004
Portsmouth City - 5103000	Brighton Elementary - 1236			x				Year 2
Portsmouth City - 5103000	Emily Spong Elementary - 1246	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Portsmouth City - 5103000	Hodges Manor Elementary - 1249	x		x				Year 2
Portsmouth City - 5103000	Lakeview Elementary - 1254	School made	AYP and will ren two cons		School Improvem n the same subje		I AYP is made	Year 1
Portsmouth City - 5103000	Mount Hermon Elementary – 1256	School made	AYP and will ren two cons		School Improvem n the same subje		I AYP is made	Year 1
Portsmouth City - 5103000	S.H. Clarke Com. Academy - 1251	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Armstrong High - 2079	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Blackwell Elementary - 1357	x		x				Year 2

		Reason Identified						
District Name & School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code Code		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004	
Richmond City - 5103240	Chandler Middle - 654	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Chimborazo Elementary - 1359	x						Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Clark Springs Elementary - 1360	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Elkhardt Middle - 1364	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Fairfield Court Elementary - 1365	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Franklin Military - 2214			х				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Fred. D.Thompson Middle - 1368	x		x				Year 1
Richmond City - 5103240	George Mason Elementary - 1370	x		x				Year 2

	District Name & School Name & NCES/CCD ID NCES/CCD ID Code							
		Reading/L	anguage Arts	Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004
Richmond City - 5103240	George W. Carver Elementary - 1862			x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	George Wythe High - 2081	x		x				Year 1
Richmond City - 5103240	John F. Kennedy High - 2082	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Maymont Elementary - 1865	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Mosby Middle - 1385	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Onslow Minnis Middle - 1263	x		x				Year 2
Richmond City - 5103240	Summer Hill/Ruffin - 1401	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					Year 1	
Richmond City - 5103240	Thomas Boushall Middle - 2078	x		х				Year 1

		Reason Identified						
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School
District Name & School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code Code	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary / middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	Improvement Status for SY 2003-2004	
Richmond City - 5103240	Whitcomb Court Elementary - 1405	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Richmond City - 5103240	Woodville Elementary - 1407	x		x				Year 2
Roanoke City - 5103300	Roanoke Academy/Math & Science - 1428	School made	School made AYP and will remain in Year 1 School Improvement Status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject area.					
Sussex City - 5103780	Annie B. Jackson Elementary - 2136	x		x				Year 1
Sussex City - 5103780	Ellen B. Chambliss Elementary - 1640	х		x				Year 1

#### III. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

#### A. Public School Choice

- Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year.
   28 (Six schools in two school divisions provided supplemental educational services (SES) in lieu of the ability to provide choice. In one division, there were no higher performing receiver schools. In the second division, the rural and remote location of the schools precluded the successful offering of choice.)
- 2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. \_\_25\_\_
- 3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. \_\_\_\_\_

#### B. Supplemental Educational Services

- 1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. \_ 0 (No schools were officially designated as Year 2 School Improvement schools during the 2002-2003 school year.)
- 2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2002-2003 school year. \_\_0\_ (No schools were officially designated as Year 2 School Improvement schools during the 2002-2003 school year.)

#### IV. HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

In the September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States provided information on the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools. For the 2002-2003 school year, please now also provide the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA) in "low-poverty" schools. (Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low poverty" as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State).

Percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers in "low-poverty" schools during the 2002-2003 school year. \_\_\_\_\_87%\_\_